

REMARKS

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-24 are in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 19 are independent claims. The remaining claims are dependent claims and depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-13, 15, 17, 18 and 19. Applicants have canceled claims 4, 6, and 14 in this response. Applicants previously canceled claims 8 and 16. Applicants previously added claims 23 and 24.

In the final rejection, claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-14, 19-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beom-Seok Lee (Pub. NO.: 2003/0234799 A1) in view of Gregory T. Janky (Patent No.: US 7,050,907). Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's assertions.

Examiner asserts that Lee teaches all of the elements described in Applicants' present invention except the step of determining whether said detected user movement is a valid movement. This step determines whether a user movement would cause an adjustment in the information being displayed to the user. This movement validity determination is a two-step process that determines the physical distance of a user from the display screen and the amount of time the user is at that determined distance. When the user has moved beyond a threshold distance and has remained beyond that distance for a predetermined amount of time, the present invention would determine that the user movement is valid and constitutes an adjustment of the screen contents to enable the user to view the contents at the further distance from the display screen. Some user movements because of distance from the screen and time at that distance are not valid movements for the purpose of making a display adjustment. As mentioned in paragraphs [0033] and [0034], it is not the desire of Applicants' invention to constantly adjust the screen. For example, if the user changes location in order to retrieve some materials and then returns to the local area, the screen should not make an adjustment to the display screen.

As the Examiner accurately states, Lee does not discuss the determination of a valid movement. Lee describes an image displaying ratio based on sensed distance and

adjusts the size of an image according to this display ratio. This process is a process automatically responses to user movements.

Janky describes a method and system for controlling an electronic device. A motion detecting component detects motion of the electronic device and generates a signal to a controller indicating the motion. The controller, in response to the signal, causes a position determining component to determine the geographic location of the electronic device. The geographic location is compared with a pre-defined zone and, in response to the comparison, a command is generated for controlling the electronic device. In Janky, the user will provide the geographic coordinates of zones of interest for electronic device that specify an area or areas in which electronic device is permitted to move without initiating a warning message to the user and the time periods which electronic device is permitted to be in those areas. The user can also specify an action that is to be initiated by processor if electronic device enters or leaves one of the pre-defined zones. If, for example, electronic device is moved outside of this position or area, service provider contacts the user and/or law enforcement agencies and informs them that unauthorized movement of electronic device has occurred.

Janky does not specify the procedures to implement an action when the electronic device is taken from an area. The description suggests that the actions to be taken when the electronic device is removed from an area are automatic actions triggered by the removal of the device from the area. Considering the application is for security and time is critical, the inference is that the actions are automatic.

In order to sustain a prima facie case of obviousness, there has to be some teaching suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the cited references. Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. As indicated above, Lee, the primary reference, fails to teach and teaches away from Applicants' present invention. Lee teaches an approach that makes automatic or continual adjustments of the display screen without considering any circumstances with regard to a user's movement.

Janky fails to provide the deficiencies of Lee. Janky also discloses an automatic response when an electronic device is taken from an area. Therefore, Janky fails to teach

the missing limitations of determining a valid movement. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Lee with Janky, and such a combination would fail to provide the missing limitations as described in Applicants' present invention. Therefore, Lee alone or in combination with Janky fails to support a finding of obviousness.

In the final rejection, claims 5, 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Beom-Soek Lee (Pub. No.: US 2003/0234799) in view of Gregory T. Janky (Patent No.: 7,050,907), further in view of Michael Dunn (Patent No.: US 6,890,007). Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's assertions.

The Examiner asserts that the combination of Lee and Janky do not teach determining whether a display has multiple sections and when the display does have multiple sections or identifying a selected section by a user for adjustment. The Examiner asserts that Dunn teaches determining whether a display has multiple sections and when the display does have multiple sections, identifying a selected section by user for adjustment.

Dunn has predefined display sections. A first portion of an image is in a peripheral vision field of a person. A second portion of the image is at a higher resolution than the first image portion in foveal vision field of the person. In Applicants' invention, the screen sections are not automatically on the screen. Paragraph [0033] and Figure 7, step 75, the user has the option to specify or not to specify sections of the display. Because the user has this option, it is necessary to determine whether a display has multiple sections.

In order to sustain a prima facie case of obviousness, there has to be some teaching suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the cited references. Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness. As indicated above, the primary references Lee and Janky, fail to teach the limitation of Applicants' present invention. Lee teaches an approach that makes automatic or continual adjustments of the display screen without considering any circumstances with regard to a user's movement. Dunn fails to provide the deficiencies of Lee and Janky. Lee teaches predetermined screen sections. Applicants' invention leaves this

determination to the user. As a result, the present invention has to determine whether a user has specified display screen portions.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings (MPEP 706.02(j)). There is no suggestion or teaching to modify Lee with Janky and or with Dunn to produce Applicant's invention. If there is no teaching, there is no prima facie case for obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested. Applicant has canceled two claims and has added two claims. Applicants have also submitted formal drawings with this response. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,



Darcell Walker

Reg. No. 34,945

P. O. Box 25048

Houston, Texas 77265

713-772-1255

December 4, 2007